

University of Texas Bulletin

No. 2408: February 22, 1924

LATIN LEAFLET

Number 11

Roberta F. Lavender, Editor

W. J. Battle and Clara M. Parker, Associate Editors



PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY FOUR TIMES A MONTH, AND ENTERED AS
SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE POSTOFFICE AT AUSTIN, TEXAS,
UNDER THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912

The *Latin Leaflet* is issued by the Department of Classical Languages in the interest of Latin teaching in the high schools of Texas.

Editor.

LATIN LEAGUE TOURNAMENT

Dallas, Friday, April 4, 1924

Much interest is being shown in the initial Latin Tournament for Texas. Letters of inquiry are coming from far and near. Many schools have already entered pupils for the contest.

Winners may expect a big surprise! Something new under the sun!! Yet thoroughly Roman!—

Bring your pupils for the tournament and stay over for the Spring Meeting of the Classical Section of T. S. T. A. to be held in Dallas on Saturday, April 5.

N. B.—As the local committee must know approximately how many to expect for the Saturday luncheon, please make plate reservation (eighty-five cents) by Monday, March 31.

Please send reservations and all requests for further information to Miss Lourania Miller, 2543 Gladstone St., Dallas, Texas.

CLASSICAL SECTION of

T. S. T. A.

Y. W. C. A.

Dallas, Texas

Saturday, April 5, 1924

Ten o'clock. Sharp

Dr. W. J. Battle, University of Texas.
Greece: Illustrated Lecture.

Miss Margaret Cotham, State Department of Education.

Round Table: Problems and Opportunities for the Latin Teacher.
Luncheon.

THE ORATION FOR ROSCIUS

In the last number of the *Leaflet* I described the circumstances leading up to the trial of Sextus Roscius of Ameria and gave a brief account of the trial itself. In this article I shall take up the oration which Cicero delivered in defense of the alleged paricide.

The oration *Pro Sexto Roscio* has a great importance for the study of the historical development of the Ciceronian style. It was delivered when Cicero was twenty-six years old and represents therefore his earliest stylistic period. Among the extant speeches it is preceded only by the oration *Pro Quinctio*, which was delivered in the previous year and has no great interest for the average student because it deals with the intricate legal aspects of a business partnership. A few years before the Roscius oration was delivered Cicero had written *De Inventione*, a work on the technique of oratory. In his early speeches we find him following rather closely the technical rules of his art, whereas in the work of his mature years he handles the rules with

greater freedom. For that reason the Roscius oration is of unusual value for one who seeks to study more closely the technical principles of Roman oratory. Stylistically the oration is characterized by a youthful enthusiasm, a richness of expression, a tendency toward poetic and figurative coloring, a profusion of rhetorical devices, which are for the most part effective, but occasionally overdone. Cicero is at this time under the influence of the Asian School of oratory, which affected highly artificial and often extravagant forms of expression, as opposed to the studied simplicity of the Attic School. At a later period Cicero knows how to blend the two extremes into that inimitable product which we call the Ciceronian style.

The oration for Roscius follows the technical division into five parts: *exordium*, *narratio*, *partitio*, *argumentatio*, *peroratio*. In few of the orations are the parts so distinctly marked off.

In the *exordium*, or introduction of the oration, Cicero observes the rule in attempting to make the jurors *attentos, dociles, benevolos*; that is, to win their close attention, to put them into a receptive frame of mind, to win their good will. Here young Cicero found himself in a situation of peculiar difficulty. It would be hard to make a jury of dignified senators listen with willing attention to a young and obscure advocate. It would be even more difficult to secure their good will, for the defendant was accused of having murdered his father, a most unnatural and horrifying crime, for which no punishment seemed severe enough. Besides, after the reign of terror, during which so many murders had been committed with impunity, the populace was clamoring for a conviction. Cicero begins by apologizing for rising to speak when so many great orators and distinguished nobles remain seated. He explains that he, an obscure man, can speak freely, whereas men of greater importance, because of the character of the times, can express their views only with serious danger to themselves. He tries to arouse the prejudice of the jury against the accusers by pointing out that after having robbed Sextus Roscius of all his possessions they are now asking the jury to put the finishing touch on their nefarious work by condemning their victim to death so that they can enjoy his property in comfort. It is

an outrage that these gentlemen of the jury, the pick of the Roman Senate, should be asked by such cut-throats to perform their dirty work for them. The speaker apologizes that because of his youth, inexperience, and nervousness he is not able to express adequately the distressing situation. He begs the jury therefore to pardon him and listen with indulgent attention. He points out the importance of the case, the throng of spectators, the fact that a decision against his client will be a signal for open murder even before the eyes of the jurors. These criminals are seeking only to have their crimes sanctioned by legal authority. Cicero ends his exordium by contrasting in finely balanced clauses the pitiful condition of his client with the rascality and audacity of the accusers. With great skill and tact he has secured the attention of his auditors by stressing the fact that the case is an extraordinary one, that it has more than mere private interest, that the welfare of all the citizens depends on the decision. He has secured their good will by his modest depreciation of his own ability, by his delicate complimenting of the jurors, by arousing sympathy for his unfortunate client, by stirring prejudice against the nefarious accusers.

In the *narratio* he sketches in a simple direct narrative style the character of the elder Sextus Roscius, who had been on the side of Sulla and the nobles; the wickedness of his two kinsmen and enemies, Titus Roscius Capito and Titus Roscius Magnus, who were professional assassins; the murder of Sextus Roscius and the events which followed, especially the part played by Sulla's powerful freedman Chrysogonus, the sale of the victim's property, the unsuccessful embassy sent by the citizens of Ameria to Sulla, and finally the attempts on the life of the dead man's son. Since the young man's enemies have been unable to kill him, they are asking the court to do it for them.

After a brief appendix to the *narratio*, in which the orator reviews the pitiful condition of his unhappy client, there follows the *partitio*, where we are told that the argument is to be divided into three main divisions: I. The refutation of the charge of parricide. II. An exposition of the audacity of the two Roscii. III. An exposition of the pernicious influence of the freedman Chrysogonus.

He begins the *argumentatio* by

stating in a few words the charge of the prosecution that Sextus Roscius had murdered his father. It is a heinous crime, of which only a man of utterly depraved character would be capable. The accusers must prove that the defendant is a man of such audacity and inhuman character. On the contrary, he has lived a quiet, chaste, industrious life on the farm, far from the luxury and immorality of the city. The accusers must prove that he had very strong motives for the crime. They have declared, but have not been able to prove, that his father disliked him and had intended to disinherit him. People who make accusations without proof lay themselves open to a charge of libel.

Here follow three digressions. The first is on the function of accusers in the state. Like watchdogs they should give the alarm when there is suspicion, but they deserve severe punishment if they bark at people for no cause whatever. The second digression treats of the nonchalant manner of the prosecuting attorney, Erucius. He should have more respect for the dignity of the jury and the seriousness of the case. This leads to a third digression on the unnaturalness of the crime of parricide and its punishment. It is intended to make more odious the carelessness of the accusers and their lack of evidence. This is the most colorful part of the entire oration. Cicero declares that according to the poets parricides are driven by the avenging Furies. That is allegorical, for the parricide is haunted by the furies of his own conscience. The punishment ordained for the parricide by the old Romans is remarkably appropriate. He is sewn alive in a sack and cast into the river, so that he who has deprived of life the parent who has given him life, should himself be deprived of sky, sun, water, earth, and all the prerogatives of living creatures.

In describing the fate of the parricide the young orator works up to a climax of eloquent emotion: "What is so common a privilege as breath of air to the living, earth to the dead, sea to them that float, shore to them that are cast forth by the sea? These wretches so live, while they may, that they cannot draw breath from the heavens, they so die that their bones are not touched by earth, they are so tossed on the waves that they are never made wet by them, they are finally so cast ashore that not even

on the rocks do they find rest in death." Even in later years Cicero, while criticizing the excessive exuberance of his youthful style, could yet quote this passage with pride. Despite its exaggerations it is effective and in its untranslatable rhythmic beauty it equals some of the finest passages in the works of the author's maturity. The audience appreciated it and applauded loudly.

From these digressions the orator returns to his main argument. He calls upon the prosecution to prove in what manner the crime was committed, whose hand dealt the blow. They were so certain that nobody would defend Sextus Roscius that they have not even tried to invent any evidence.

The second main division of the argument is directed against the Roscii. Cicero apologizes first for putting this in the form of an accusation, for he is by nature a defender and not a prosecutor. He purposes to ascend the ladder of success through his own merit, not through bringing disaster upon others. He charges Roscius Magnus with having committed the murder. There is strong *prima facie* evidence. He and his accomplices are enjoying the dead man's estates while the son has been reduced to abject poverty. Since the murder was committed at Rome, it is more likely that the assassin was Roscius Magnus, who was then at Rome, than Sextus Roscius, who was then at Ameria and had not been in Rome for years. Besides, Magnus had abundant opportunity for such a crime, since he had been associating with gangs of assassins. The events following the crime were very suspicious. The report was carried to Ameria by Mallius Glaucia, a client and friend of Magnus. It was reported not to the dead man's son or his relatives, but to his enemy, Roscius Capito, who was manifestly an accomplice in the crime, for he now possesses three of the stolen estates. It was these Roscii who secured the aid of Sulla's freedman Chrysogonus. There is a description of the embassy sent by the Amerians to Sulla; how Capito, one of the legates, betrayed his nine colleagues. The violation of the sanctity of an embassy is a serious crime. Yet this vile character, who could betray the comrades who trusted him, is soon to appear on the witness stand against the man he has ruined. It was good technique to discredit a witness before he gave his testimony.

Magnus is attacked for refusing to allow two of the slaves of the murdered man to be examined. They had been present at the murder and their testimony would be very valuable. It is a suspicious fact that these slaves are now with Chrysogonus, who is treating them with unusual honor. But Chrysogonus is not the guilty man. He is formidable because of his power and influence.

Thus by a neat transition the orator passes to the third part of his argument, which is against the influence of Chrysogonus. He questions the legality of the auction in which Chrysogonus sold the property of the murdered man at one three-thousandth part of its value. Chrysogonus is a clever crook, the master mind of a gang of criminals. There is a sarcastic description of this extravagant upstart, this dandy who thinks himself the most important personage in the Republic. The nobles should not be offended at this attack on Chrysogonus. Cicero favors the party of the nobles and rejoices at the victory of Sulla, but he deplores the rise of such rascals as Chrysogonus, who are defeating the purpose of Sulla, for is not the great Dictator striving to restore law and order? It would be a pity if the best blood in the state has been spilled only in order that unscrupulous slaves and freedmen like Chrysogonus should have the license to run amuck.

The orator turns finally to the *peroratio*, the concluding appeal to the jury. Sextus Roscius, although he has good grounds for making accusations, is accusing no one. He does not even seek to recover his property. He asks only that he be allowed to leave the trial a free man. Chrysogonus has stripped his victim of everything so that he is dependent on the charity of his friends. Let him be satisfied with that. Why does he thirst for his blood? But if Chrysogonus insists, then the only refuge for the unfortunate man is in the clemency of the jury. The conviction of this innocent man will establish a dangerous precedent. It will embolden criminals to further crimes. It will lead to a new reign of terror more dreadful than that just ended. Let the jurors show that those scenes of horror and cruelty have not destroyed all human feeling in the state.

Outline of the oration:

- A. Exordium, §§ 1-14.
- B. Narratio, §§ 15-28.

- (Egressio, §§ 29-34, emotional comment on narratio)
- C. Partitio, §§ 35-36.
- D. Argumentatio, §§ 37-142.
 - I. Refutatio criminis, §§ 37-82.
 - II. Contra audaciam Rosciorum, §§ 83-123.
 - III. Contra potentiam Chrysogoni, §§ 124-142.
- E. Peroratio, §§ 143-154.

H. J. LEON

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE IN CICERO'S DAY

In order to understand the orations of Cicero, to the reading of which the Latin pupil is brought early in his study of the language, some knowledge of the methods of the courts of his day must be had; and it is the purpose of this paper to present in condensed form the various steps preliminary to the trial of a criminal suit, then the details of the trial itself.

Sulla during the period of his dictatorship, 82-79 B.C., had reorganized the judicial system of Rome by creating a series of standing courts (*quaestiones perpetuae*), each having jurisdiction over certain specified types of crimes. For convenience these courts are enumerated: 1. *Quaestio rerum repetundarum* for cases of extortion; 2. *quaestio peculatus* for cases of embezzlement; 3. *quaestio maiestatis* for cases of treason; 4. *quaestio de ambitu* for cases of fraud at elections; 5. *quaestio de sicariis et veneficiis* for cases of murder; 6. *quaestio de falsis* for cases of forgery; 7. *quaestio de iniuria* for cases of personal violence. Each of these courts was presided over by a *praetor* or by a *iudex quaestionis*, the latter being designated when no *praetor* was available; such a presiding officer was known generally as the *quaesitor*.

The court itself was composed of senators—the number varied according to the case, being as high as seventy-five in some instances—who were selected in the following manner: Each year a list of senators who would be available for jury duty was drawn up and divided into a number of decuries (*decuriae*); to each case a definite decury was assigned, from which there was chosen by lot a number of names greater than was the required number of jurors for the case, the extra names being chosen to permit rejection (*relectio*) by challenging on the part

of the accused and the prosecutor. In the event that one decury did not provide a sufficient number of jurors, the next decury might be called upon the complete tally; such a process was called *subsortitio*, and was regulated jointly by the *iudex quaestionis* and the *praetor urbanus*.

Between January 1 and September 1 a criminal indictment could be lodged by any citizen. From September 1 to December 31 occurred a holiday period during which the ordinary courts took a vacation. The latter part of the Roman year was so cluttered with sacred games and festivals that all legal processes except trials in cases of public violence were suspended.

The *tribunal*, or court room, was the Forum; there sat the *praetor* on his curule chair, or the *iudex quaestionis*, with the *iudices* upon their benches (*subsellia*). The accused and the prosecutor, with their advocates, assistants, and witnesses, were located upon other benches in the foreground. Trials took place in daytime only, customarily between the hours of 9 a. m. and 4 p. m.

The first step in the bringing of a criminal suit was to appear before the *praetor* or president of the proper court and request permission to lodge a charge. This step was known as *postulatio*. At this time the accuser took an oath as to his good faith in bringing the accusation and usually permission to proceed with his charge was granted unless the applicant was under the ban of *infamia*.

Since the law allowed but one prosecutor for each case, in the event that two or more attempted to bring the same accusation against an individual, a *divinatio*, or preliminary investigation of the merits and motives of each prospective accuser, was held to determine which should perform the duty. It was at such a *divinatio* that Cicero delivered his speech *In Q. Caecilium*, the first of the famous Verrine orations. Generally, when a *divinatio* was resorted to, since no evidence dealing with the main charge was brought forward, but the qualifications and disqualifications of the rival candidates for the job were aired in discussion, it was the better speaker who won the day and was allowed to proceed with the accusation.

Following the *postulatio*, or *divinatio* if that process had been necessary, there was a formal denunciation of the accused by the prosecutor in the

presence of the *quaesitor*; this was the *nominis delatio*. At this preliminary investigation the accused had to appear and submit to examination by the prosecutor whose task it was to establish a probability of guilt. If this were done to the satisfaction of the *quaesitor*, that official rendered a formal report (*nominis receptio*), upon which the accused assumed the status of a defendant (*reus*). At the same time a day of trial was set by the *quaesitor*, usually ten days after the *nominis receptio*; a shorter interval was considered illegal.

During the interval between the *nominis receptio* and the day of trial the accused was placed under no restraint, but was wholly free. In cases of unquestionable guilt the defendant frequently went into voluntary exile, in which event the trial might take place just the same, although it is probable that an administrative act of interdiction was used at times to settle such cases. On the other hand, if for any reason whatsoever the accuser failed to appear at the time set for the trial, the case was immediately dismissed; and if it could be shown that maliciousness had impelled him to bring the charge, the accuser might himself be charged with *infamia* and in the event of conviction was forever barred from bringing another accusation against anyone.

Before the day of the trial the accused, his friends, and his clients, were wont to appear in mourning garb—an attempt to excite pity and compassion in the *iudices*. If a *reus* failed to observe this custom, he was considered extremely contumacious and such disregard for tradition and convention probably militated greatly against him at the trial.

On the appointed day of the trial all parties concerned were summoned by a herald to appear at the *tribunal*. The first step in the proceedings was the *relectio* or challenging of the *iudices* by the accuser and the accused, after which the *iudices* who remained to sit in the case were required to take oath. Cicero refers to the fact that the *iudices* render their decisions under oath in his oration, *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*, Chapter III, Section 8.

The opposing legal talent were: For the state, the *accusator*, who might have as many as three *subscriptores* or assistants equally liable with him in the case. The *accusator* was frequently a professional lawyer who undertook the prosecution as the

agent of someone else, as did Erucius who accused Roscius of Ameria at the instigation of Chrysogonus.

For the *reus*, or accused, there was a *patronus* or defense counsel, a part that Cicero handled with so much success in the Roscius case. As many as three or four *patroni* were allowed to participate in the trial, and, unlike the *accusator* whose *subscriptores* were assistants subordinate to him in all respects, the *patroni* were all of equal rank and importance in the conduct of the case.

Following the swearing of the *iudices*, the prosecutor launched the case against the defendant with a set speech, after which the defense counsel replied with an argument similarly formal. These set speeches were introductory to the evidence which was to be presented later, and served to acquaint the *iudices* with the various aspects of the case. A great amount of importance was attached to these *orationes perpetuae* as they were called. All the facts of the evidence were as a rule discussed in detail, and a shrewd lawyer who was also a capable orator could frequently go far toward winning his case before ever a single witness took the stand. The actual presentation of evidence and examination of witnesses, for instance, in the Roscius case could have been little more than a matter of formality after the startling way in which Cicero had exposed the plot of Chrysogonus in his preliminary speech. A herald announced the close of the *orationes perpetuae* by saying "*dixerunt.*"

The taking of evidence was the next step in the procedure. Witnesses were called and examined, first by the side which had summoned them, next by the opposing side. All evidence was recorded by a clerk. The rules of evidence were rather involved, but a few of the main points will serve to show their general tenor. The prosecution had the right to compel testimony (*testimonium denuntiari*) from a limited number of witnesses, but the defense could resort to voluntary witnesses only; free men testified under oath, whereas evidence from slaves was acceptable only when it had been procured under torture (We may cite here another example from the case of Roscius: Chap. XXVII, Sec. 77, where Cicero urges Chrysogonus, who has gained possession of all the slaves of Roscius, to permit two of the slaves to come for examination); the testimony of a witness in the case of a

relative was inadmissible, nor could a freedman give evidence damaging to his *patronus*; the evidence of a single witness was not sufficient to bring about a conviction; the testimony of a person who had once been convicted of *infamia* was not admissible; written evidence (*testimonium per tabulas*) from compulsory or voluntary witnesses who were unable to appear in person was admitted, provided, however, that such depositions had been given voluntarily; these *tabulae* might be read during the *oratio perpetua* (compare the reading of the *decurionum decretum* from Ameria in the Roscius: Chap. IX, Sec. 24), or might be presented along with the rest of the evidence; documentary evidence in the form of private ledgers and account books might be brought in, while copies (*tabulae*) of important public records were acceptable.

When all of the evidence had been presented for the information of the court, the *altercatio* took place. In this the prosecutor and defense counsel engaged in a contest of verbal fencing—a series of brief questions and answers bearing upon the case and the facts which had come to light. There were no formal speeches of argument following the taking of the evidence.

At the close of the brief *altercatio* the judges rendered their decision by ballot. The process of voting was called in *consilium ire*. A *iudex* could vote only one of three ways: an "A" on his ballot was for *absolvo*, "I acquit"; "C" was for *condemno*, "I declare him guilty"; while "NL" was for *non liquet*, "not proven." A majority of votes was necessary for conviction; unless a majority of the ballots were marked "C," or "NL," the defendant was acquitted. The *quaesitor* counted the ballots (*tabulas diribere*): if the count showed conviction the president announced: "*fecisse videtur*," "it is apparent that he committed the deed"; if the accused was acquitted by the ballots the statement of the president was: "*non fecisse videtur*"; but if a majority of the votes cast were marked "NL" the president declared "*amplius* (sc. *cognoscendum*)," "it must be investigated more fully," and a second trial resulted.

T. B. STEEL.

NOTES FROM THE FORT
WORTH CLASSICS SECTION
MEETING

The meeting was held on Friday, November 29, 1923, in the library of the Presbyterian Church at Fifth and Taylor streets. Miss Mattie B. McLeod of Houston, presided.

To help supply funds for the expenses of the Section, it was voted that each member should pay one dollar per year as dues.

Miss Lavender made report of her work on behalf of Latin in the schools of the state. She had visited schools in twenty-one towns; had made speeches to two hundred audiences; had reached approximately 80,000 people. She made a plea for the active support of the *Latin Leaflet* by teachers over the state and made announcement of the Service Bureau for the aid of Latin teachers recently established at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, under the direction of Miss Frances M. Sabin.

Mr. Cawthorn, supervisor of high schools, Dallas, invited all friends of Latin to the Latin Tournament to be held on April 4 in Dallas. Miss Lourania Miller of Dallas, on behalf of the tournament gave particulars as to its scope and plan. Miss Lois Campbell, one of Miss Miller's students, explained the tournament from the point of view of the class.

The main address of the meeting was now delivered by Mr. F. C. Rand, president of the International Shoe Company of St. Louis, one of the leading manufacturers of that city. Mr. Rand believes that Latin is worth while from the point of view of the practical business man, as well as that of the scholar. In charming fashion he developed this idea with many illustrations, much to the comfort of his audience, although, alas, there were not many present who were not already convinced of the truth of what he said.

The Section now united with the Modern Language Section for a joint session, under the chairmanship of Professor Glascock, formerly of Rice, now of the University of Texas.

The first paper was read by Dr. Battle on the Basis of Western Civilization. Dr. Battle found this basis to be in the culture of Greece and Rome and argued that the possession and study of this common heritage formed one of the main bonds tying not only Europe together but all the

peoples that speak European languages.

The next paper was read by Dr. Blaney of Rice Institute on Modern Languages and Modern History. Dr. Blaney discussed in trenchant fashion the significance of language as a factor in history.

Adjournment was now held for a classical luncheon in the Longhorn Room in the Texas Hotel. About one hundred were present. As a souvenir each guest was given a charming Libellus outlining the program which was carried out as follows:

Symposium Apud Magistros
Linguarum Antiquarum
In Hospitio Texas
Tempore Supplicationis
Pridie Kalendas Decembres
MCMXXIII

C E N A
Confectum

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Sapor Indus | Oleae |
| Pulla Regi Idonea | |
| Tubera | Cacumina Asparagi |
| Ova Lacte | Commixta Congelataque |
| Cum Placentis | |
| Coffea | |

ORATIONES

PRAETERITA ADHUC NOBISCUM SUNT
Magister Bibendi.....R. C. Forman
Plautus et Fontes Comici Effecti.....

.....H. J. Leon
Lucretius Irreligiosus.....J. W. Bishop
Catullus, Poetarum Gratissimus.....

.....D. A. Penick
Vergilius et Gratia.....J. N. Brown
Horatius et Recentiores.....R. Paschal

Ovidius, Rerum Inanium Amans.....
.....F. C. Rand

Petronius, Arbiter Elegantiae.....
.....J. W. Downer

Fons Inspirationis Romanae.....
.....W. J. Battle

Carmina LatinaOmnes

The luncheon was good. The speeches were applauded. The singing of the songs at the last added a delightful note of good cheer.

In the afternoon there was a round-table discussion led by Miss Gardner of Fort Worth and Miss Wallace of Mineral Wells, on Latin as a means of a better understanding of English.

Miss Lavender was to discuss "What Latin Is of Greatest Worth?" but the time was too short for more than a start on it. She stressed the importance, first, of inducing students to begin Latin; second, of holding their interest while in the high school;

third, of inducing them to continue Latin in college; fourth, of encouraging them to take up teaching it as a profession. In the main the high-school teachers present agreed with Miss Lavender but they insisted that the failure of students to take Latin in college was as much the fault of the college as it was of the high school.

It was voted to appoint a committee to develop plans to carry out Miss Lavender's ideas.

It was voted to appoint a committee to coöperate with the educational survey now being made in Texas.

It was suggested by Miss Lavender that it would be appropriate for the *Latin Leaflet* to be prepared by teachers of different cities in turn; to be printed and controlled, however, as heretofore by the University. Doubt was expressed as to the practicability of this, but the Section voted its approval of the plan if it could be carried out.

It was voted to ask the University of Texas to grant Miss Lavender a year's leave of absence to visit the schools of the state in the interest of Latin, and a committee was authorized to present the matter to President Sutton.

It was voted to extend the cordial thanks of the Section to Mr. Rand for his noteworthy address and for his generosity in refusing to accept the cost of his trip.

Officers were elected for the coming years as follows: Chairman, Miss Mattie B. McLeod of Houston; Vice-Chairman, Miss Annie Forsgard of Waco; Second Vice-Chairman, Miss Annie Laurie Walker of Fort Worth; Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. J. N. Brown, of Denton.

A rising vote of thanks was given to Miss Walker of Fort Worth and to Miss Lourania Miller of Dallas for their effective work in connection with the meeting.

An informal discussion was now held in response to an invitation by Dr. Battle to consider the question of the supply of Latin teachers for the state. Miss Lavender reported that there had been 68 calls at the University for teachers of Latin and 18 students to supply them. Texas Woman's College reported ten calls which could not be filled there, and so on. Much interest was shown in the discussion. The most practical suggestion for bettering the situation was that each Latin teacher should explain to his classes what the need and possibilities were.

A LATIN CAMPAIGN

At the Fort Worth meeting, the Classics Section resolved to conduct a campaign for increased interest in Latin during 1924. Because of the size of the state this is to be done by a district plan, using the eighteen districts already defined in the state.

Each district will have a chairman who will appoint a county chairman in each county of the district. It is earnestly desired to give a personal and sympathetic touch to the work by such coöperative plans. The district chairmen will be urged to make their reports in person at the next general meeting.

The following are the chairmen of the respective districts: First District—Miss Opie Dalby, Texarkana; Second District—Miss Emma Scott, Orange; Third District—Mr. S. E. Wronker, Terrell; Fourth District—Miss Thelma Baker, Bonham; Fifth District—Miss Lourania Miller, Dallas; Sixth District—Miss Mattie Sue Barton, Corsicana; Seventh District—Mr. R. L. Nisbet, Crockett; Eighth District—Miss Leola Wheelless, Houston; Ninth District—Miss Mildred Kerns, Alvin; Tenth District—; Eleventh District—Miss Elizabeth Alexander, Belton; Twelfth District—Miss Annie Laurie Walker, Fort Worth; Thirteenth District—Miss Anna Thompson, Bowie; West, San Antonio; Fifteenth District—Miss Marian Riess, Pharr; Sixteenth District—Mr. E. L. Nunnally, San Angelo; Seventeenth District—Miss Laura Wallace, Mineral Wells; Eighteenth District—Miss Vivian Coffman, Canyon.

MATTIE B. MCLEOD.

MISS LAVENDER ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Readers of the *Leaflet* will be sorry to learn that Miss Lavender's health made it desirable for her to take a rest from teaching after the fall term. She is taking a course of treatment in Berkeley, California, under a distinguished specialist. She writes cheerfully and there is no reason to doubt that she will resume her work next fall. The University classes are being taken in part by other members of the classical staff, in part by Mrs. Ila Irl Nelson, formerly Grace Lightfoot, a graduate of the University and a successful teacher in high school.

B.